

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
TYLER DIVISION

TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES §  
LIMITED, LLC §  
§ v. § CASE NO. 6:12-cv-200  
§

ACER INC and ACER AMERICA §  
CORPORATION §

---

TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES §  
LIMITED, LLC §  
§ v. § CASE NO. 6:12-cv-201  
§

BROTHER INDUSTRIES LTD and §  
BROTHER INTERNATIONAL §  
CORPORATION §

---

TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES §  
LIMITED §  
§ v. § CASE NO. 6:12-cv-202  
§

CANON, INC. and CANON U.S.A., INC §  
§

---

TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES §  
LIMITED §  
§ v. § CASE NO. 6:12-cv-203  
§

DANE ELEC CORP. USA and DANE §  
ELEC MEMORY §

---

<b>TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED</b>	§	
v.	§	<b>CASE NO. 6:12-cv-204</b>
<b>DELL, INC.</b>	§	
	§	
<b>TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED</b>	§	
v.	§	<b>CASE NO. 6:12-cv-205</b>
<b>FALCON NORTHWEST COMPUTER SYSTEMS, INC.</b>	§	
	§	
<b>TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED</b>	§	
v.	§	<b>CASE NO. 6:12-cv-206</b>
<b>FUJITSU LIMITED and FUJITSU AMERICA, INC.</b>	§	
	§	
<b>TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED</b>	§	
v.	§	<b>CASE NO. 6:12-cv-207</b>
<b>HITI DIGITAL, INC. and HITI DIGITAL AMERICA, INC.</b>	§	
	§	
<b>TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED</b>	§	
v.	§	<b>CASE NO. 6:12-cv-208</b>
<b>HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY</b>	§	
	§	

**TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES** §  
**LIMITED** §  
v. § **CASE NO. 6:12-cv-209**

**JASCO PRODUCTS COMPANY** §  
§

---

**TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES** §  
**LIMITED** §  
§

v. § **CASE NO. 6:12-cv-210**

**KINGSTON TECHNOLOGY CO., INC** §  
§

---

**TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES** §  
**LIMITED** §  
§

v. § **CASE NO. 6:12-cv-211**

**LEXAR MEDIA, INC. and MICRON** §  
**TECHNOLOGY, INC.** §

---

**TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES** §  
**LIMITED** §  
§

v. § **CASE NO. 6:12-cv-212**

**MICRODIA LIMITED** §  
§

---

**TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES** §  
**LIMITED** §  
§

v. § **CASE NO. 6:12-cv-213**

**NEWEGG INC and** §  
**ROSEWILL INC.** §

---

<b>TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED, LLC</b>	§ § § §	
v.	§	<b>CASE NO. 6:12-cv-214</b>
<b>SABRENT</b>	§ §	
	-----	
<b>TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED, LLC</b>	§ § § §	
v.	§	<b>CASE NO. 6:12-cv-215</b>
<b>SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO. LTD. and SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS USA, INC.</b>	§ § §	
	-----	
<b>TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED, LLC</b>	§ § § §	
v.	§	<b>CASE NO. 6:12-cv-216</b>
<b>SEIKO EPSON CORPORATION and EPSON AMERICA, INC.</b>	§ §	
	-----	
<b>TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED, LLC</b>	§ § § §	
v.	§	<b>CASE NO. 6:12-cv-217</b>
<b>SHUTTLE, INC. and SHUTTLE COMPUTER GROUP, INC.</b>	§ §	
	-----	
<b>TECHNOLOGY PROPERTIES LIMITED, LLC</b>	§ § § §	
v.	§	<b>CASE NO. 6:12-cv-218</b>
<b>SYSTEMAX, INC.</b>	§ §	
	-----	

**ORDER**

Plaintiff recently filed a series of related cases (listed above). The Court will hold a joint scheduling conference in these cases. Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** Plaintiff to file a notice of readiness for scheduling conference when all Defendants in **all of the listed cases** have either answered or filed a motion to transfer or dismiss.<sup>1</sup> The notice must be filed simultaneously in each case within five days of the last remaining Defendant's answer or motion. The notice must include a list of any pending motions to dismiss or transfer and a list of any other related cases filed in the Eastern District of Texas involving the same patent(s).

If the cases are not ready for scheduling conference within ninety (90) days of this order, Plaintiff must file a detailed status report explaining the reason for the delay.

**It is SO ORDERED.**

**SIGNED this 11th day of April, 2012.**



MICHAEL H. SCHNEIDER  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff should not delay filing the notice because of later-filed, related cases.